FILED BY CLERK
DEC 17 2008
COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
STATE OF ARIZONA
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA, Appellee, v. ANTHONY VEAMATAHAU, Appellant.	2 CA-CR 2008-0093 DEPARTMENT B MEMORANDUM DECISION Not for Publication Rule 111, Rules of the Supreme Court

APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF PIMA COUNTY

Cause No. CR-20063136

Honorable Howard Fell, Judge Pro Tempore

AFFIRMED

DiCampli, Elsberry & Hunley, LLC
By Anne Elsberry
Tucson
Attorneys for Appellant

E S P I N O S A, Judge.

¶1 After appellant Anthony Veamatahau voluntarily waived his right to a jury trial, the trial court found him guilty of three counts of armed robbery and three counts of aggravated robbery. The court further found the armed robberies were dangerous-nature

offenses and sentenced Veamatahau to a combination of concurrent and consecutive, presumptive terms totaling fourteen years' imprisonment.

¶2 Counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, 2 P.3d 89 (App. 1999), avowing she has reviewed the entire record and found no meritorious issue to raise on appeal. Veamatahau has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶3 Viewed in the light most favorable to upholding Veamatahau's convictions, *see State v. Ossana*, 199 Ariz. 459, ¶ 2, 18 P.3d 1258, 1259 (App. 2001), the evidence established that, in August 2006, Veamatahau entered a convenience store with another man who was armed with a gun. While his companion demanded and obtained money from the store's clerk and then pulled a female customer to the ground, Veamatahau took the products the customer had just purchased and additional items from the store's shelves. Less than fifteen minutes later, the two men entered another convenience store. Veamatahau's companion pointed the gun at the store clerk and demanded money, and Veamatahau again took products from the store's shelves.

¶4 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have reviewed the record in its entirety and have found neither fundamental nor reversible error. Substantial evidence supported all the elements necessary to sustain Veamatahau's convictions, *see* A.R.S. §§ 13-1902, 13-1903, 13-1904, and his sentences were authorized under A.R.S. §§ 13-604(I) and 13-701(C)(2).

¶5 We note, however, that the sentencing minute entry erroneously reports that the convictions were based on a plea of guilty and fails to reflect the trial court's finding that the armed robberies were dangerous-nature offenses warranting enhanced sentences pursuant to § 13-604. We conclude these are harmless, technical errors that do not require remand. *See* Ariz. Const. art. VI, § 27 ("No cause shall be reversed for technical error in pleadings or proceedings when upon the whole case it shall appear that substantial justice has been done."); *State v. Cornell*, 179 Ariz. 314, 322 n.1, 878 P.2d 1352, 1360 n.1 (1994) (disparity between court's oral statements and minute entry "at most a harmless technical error").

¶6 Accordingly, we amend the minute entry of March 18, 2008, to conform to the trial court's oral pronouncement of judgment and sentence. Veamatahau's convictions and sentences are affirmed.

_____
PHILIP G. ESPINOSA, Judge

CONCURRING:

_____
PETER J. ECKERSTROM, Presiding Judge

_____
GARYE L. VÁSQUEZ, Judge